DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 379 EA 023 101

AUTHOR Greenfield, William D.
TITLE Rationale and Methods To Articulate Ethics and Administrator Training.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Problems; *Administrator Education; *Administrator Role; Conflict of Interest; Decision Making; Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethical Instruction; *Ethics; Evaluative Thinking; Higher Education; Leadership Qualities; *Moral Values; Organizational Climate; *Public Schools

ABSTRACT

Given the moral nature of public schools and the numerous moral dilemmas faced by school administrators, training in ethics should be included in administrator preparation curricula. After discussing the public school as a moral institution, this document explains normative ethics and outlines the differences between moral and nonmoral judgments. The moral dimension of school administration, with emphasis on the moral complexity of the administrator's role, is explored in detail, with examples from recent literature used to illustrate the kinds of moral issues and dilemmas school administrators experience. Distinct types of ethical dilemmas are described, and the rationale for training in moral reasoning is explained. Also discussed are conceptions of leadership and the use of power. A final section offers five strategies for articulating training in values and ethics in administrator preparation and discusses related obstacles. (30 references) (CLA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Rationale and Methods to Articulate Ethics and Administrator Training

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. D. Greenfield
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

William D. Greenfield

Portland State University

Introduction

Normative ethics involves philosophical thinking about what is "right, good, or obligatory", and "it may take the form of debating with oneself or with someone else about what is good or right in a particular case or as a general principal, and then forming such a normative judgement as a conclusion". (Frankena, 1973: 4) Public school administrators engage in such thinking frequently (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1986; Crowson, 1989), and it seems reasonable that they should be expected to be competent in skills of moral reasoning. While many school administrators undoubtedly are competent in this area, the formal consideration of ethics in administrator preparation curricula is a fairly recent phenomenon.

The two-fold purpose in this paper is to discuss some of the reasons why competence in moral reasoning should be an objective in administrator preparation, and to suggest ideas regarding methods to accomplish such a goal. There are four parts to the paper. The first section offers a brief rationale as to why competence in moral reasoning is of special concern in the preparation of school administrators. The second section defines the idea of moral reasoning in an effort to define what it is

A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, April 3-7, 1991, Chicago, Illinois.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED332379
EA023101

that such a curriculum might accomplish. The third part of the paper draws upon several examples from recent literature to illustrate the kinds of moral issues and dilemmas school administrators experience, and the final section offers some ideas regarding the inclusion of a moral dimension in administrator training.

The Public School as a Moral Institution

A premise central to the ideas advanced here is that the American public school is fundamentally a moral institution by virtue of its goal to prepare children to assume the roles and responsibilities of citizenship in a democratic society. While there are other goals which schools seek to accomplish, none are so central as this, and it is this moral socialization function of public schools which distinguishes the work of the school administrator from that of administrative counter-parts in other organizational contexts. The public school administrator, because of the office held if for no other reason, is a moral agent. Thus the school administrator, as will be illustrated below, has a special responsibility to be a "conscientious moral actor; that is, to take actions and make decisions in a distinctly moral manner" (Greenfield, 1987b: 4)

School administration, in contrast to administration in other organizations, makes a unique set of ethical demands on the administrator. While administrators in every organization encounter ethical dilemmas, and while administrators of public agencies may

be distinguished from their colleagues in other contexts as being duty-bound to a special ethic to serve the public good, public school administrators are unique in the special obligation accompanying their role and office: to conduct themselves in a distinctly moral manner (Dewey, 1957) in fulfilling their professional duties and responsibilities. "Distinctly moral conduct by a school administrator means that one's behavior is grounded in deliberate reflection upon and consideration of the moral consequences of one's decisions, actions, school policies, and practices." (Greenfield, 1987b: 1) That is, there is a deliberate effort to reflect on one's actions in moral terms.

There are several reasons why the conduct of public school administrators must be **deliberately** moral. Not only are the goals of public schools normative in character, in terms of the moral socialization of children to society's norms of responsible democratic citizenship, but most of the children whom a school serves are minors, have no choice about whether or where they attend school, and have no voice in determining either the quality, content, or purpose of the curriculum they experience in their role as student. The school administrator is duty-bound to see to it that the child's best interests are well-served by their experiences in school.

Further, the activities of schooling have consequences for society as well as for the individual, and because the consequences of schooling affect the interests and welfare of all school

participants, the larger school community, and society's mores, the school is a moral institution. Thus a public school administrator, as the individual legally and professionally responsible for the processes and outcomes of schooling, is obligated not only to individual students but to the larger community as well.

These are the special conditions shaping the office and role of the public school administrator, and this is particularly so for principals and superintendents. The public school administrator is a moral agent, and the requirements of the office demand competence in skills of moral reasoning. Further, it is these conditions which obligate those responsible for the professional training and development of school administrators to be deliberate in designing and implementing training curricula which cultivate and develop within prospective administrators the attitudes and beliefs, the knowledge, and the skills necessary for fulfilling the requirements of that role and office.

Normative Ethics

In earlier work I have referred to the ideas of value leadership and moral imagination, and to the moral dimension of administrative work (Greenfield, 1986 a and b; 1987 a and b; 1988a; and 1991 a and b). The brief discussion here is a further effort to clarify these ideas and to provide the reader with frame of reference for the discussion in the remainder of the paper.

Frankena (1973) takes "ethics to be primarily concerned with providing the general outlines of a normative theory to help us in

answering problems about what is right or ought to be done...." (p. 5) Among the factors he associates with the institution of morality, three are central: "certain **forms of judgement** in which **particular** objects are said to have or not have a certain moral quality, obligation, or responsibility; some **rules, principles, ideals,** and **virtues** that can be expressed in more **general judgements** and that form the background against which particular judgements are made and reasons given for them; and certain **sanctions** or additional sources of motivation that are also often expressed in verbal judgements, namely, holding responsible, praising, and blaming...." (p. 9)

Frankena further notes that normative judgements may be ethical or moral judgements proper, or that they may be nonmoral judgements. Further, whether moral or nonmoral, normative judgements may refer to general or particular judgements of obligation or value. Examples of the differences between judgements of moral obligation (**deontic** judgements) and those of moral value (**aretaic** judgements), and of the differences between moral and nonmoral normative judgements are illustrated on the next page in Figure 1. The latter kinds of normative judgements (the nonmoral variety listed as Category II) do not concern a consideration of things that can be good or bad in a moral or ethical sense, although it may turn out that a consideration of these nonmoral judgements is necessary in determining what is morally right or wrong. (1973: 10) The former kind of judgements

I. Ethical or moral judgements proper:

A. Judgements of moral obligation (**deontic** judgements):
1. Particular, e.g. (assuming terms are used in their moral senses),
   a. I ought not to escape from prison now.
   b. You should become a missionary.
   c. What he did was wrong.
2. General, e.g.,
   a. We ought to keep our agreements.
   b. Love is the fulfillment of the moral law.
   c. All men have a right to freedom.

B. Judgements of moral value (**aretaic** judgements):
1. Particular, e.g.,
   a. My grandfather was a good man.
   b. Xavier was a saint.
   c. He is responsible for what he did.
   d. You deserve to be punished.
   e. Her character is admirable.
   f. His motive was good.
2. General, e.g.,
   a. Benevolence is a virtue.
   b. Jealousy is an ignoble motive.
   c. The man who can forgive such carelessness is a saint.
   d. The good man does not cheat or steal.

II. Nonmoral normative judgements:

A. Judgements of nonmoral value:
1. Particular, e.g.,
   a. That is a good car.
   b. Miniver Cheevy did not have a very good life.
2. General, e.g.,
   a. Pleasure is good in itself.
   b. Democracy is the best form of government.

B. Judgements of nonmoral obligation:
1. Particular, e.g.,
   a. You ought to buy a new suit.
   b. You just have to go to that concert.
2. General, e.g.,
   a. In building a bookcase one should use nails, not Scotch tape.
   b. The right thing to do on fourth down with thirteen yards to go is to punt.

(Frankena, 1973: 10-11)

Figure 1

consequence. Frankena refers to judgements about whether an action has a good or bad motive as **deontic** judgements, or judgements of moral obligation. He refers to judgements about whether an action has a good or bad consequence as **aretaic** judgements, or judgements (Category I) involve a moral or ethical consideration of motive or of moral value (1973: 9).

For Frankena, morality "is a social enterprise, not just a discovery or invention of the individual for his own guidance. Like one's language, state, or church, it exists before the individual, who is inducted into it and becomes more or less of a participant in it, and it goes on existing after him....As first encountered by the individual,... it is an instrument of society as a whole for the guidance of individuals and smaller groups". (1973: 6)

For the public school administrator then, there appear to be several "layers" of obligation and motive: society's standards of good conduct (one should always be honest; parents should look out for the welfare and interests of their children); the profession's standards rooted in principles of good pedagogical practice (teachers ought to care about the welfare of students, ought to have high expectations for students, and should strive to apply the most appropriate and up-to-date principles of teaching and learning); the school's or district's standards as reflected in school board policies, organizational rules and regulations, and state and federal laws and guidelines; and the community's standards as reflected in prevailing community norms regarding the

actions of students, parents, teachers, and school administrators.

Thus a major source of moral frustration for the school administrator is the complex constellation of competing and conflicting standards of good conduct reflected among these different sources of moral regulation. It often is not clear what is right or wrong, or what one ought to do, or which perspective is right in moral terms. Or, it may be clear what one ought to do, in moral terms, but circumstances may not permit that course of action.

Adding a moral dimension to the curriculum design for the preparation of school administrators could enable a prospective principal or superintendent to develop the attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, and skills associated with competence in moral reasoning. A failure to provide the opportunity for school administrators to develop such competence constitutes a failure to serve the children we are obligated to serve as public educators. As a profession, educational administration thus has a moral obligation to train prospective administrators to be able to apply appropriate the principles, rules, ideals, and virtues associated with competence in moral reasoning.

Competence in moral reasoning is fundamental to the ability to administer a school in a distinctly moral manner. "Action is distinctly moral when it is deliberate and is based on choices that reflect thinking about decision or action alternatives not only in terms of their comparative practical advantages and disadvantages,

but also in terms of the welfare of all those who stand to be affected by the decision or action." (Greenfield, 1987b: 5) To be able to do this competently requires some level of knowledge and skill associated with moral reasoning, and as well requires the motive to act in such a manner. While we cannot "make" persons virtuous or motivated to administer schools in a distinctly moral manner, through education and training it is possible to cultivate conditions which increase one's moral competence and heighten one's awareness of the special necessity for a school administrator to be deliberately moral.

The Moral Dimension of the Work of School Administration

The object in this section is to discuss more fully the meanings and implications of the moral dimension of the work of school administration. There are several perspectives to be considered. One concerns the character of the administrator. What are this person's vices and virtues? Is the individual a person of integrity? Does the administrator satisfactorily represent the status of the position of principal, or superintendent? Can the individual be trusted? There are a host of personal qualities (virtues) one might identify as desirable in the character of the school administrator. In terms of administrator preparation, this perspective is addressed in terms of recruitment and selection criteria, and in terms of the expectations for administrators that are found in the AASA's code of ethics, or which may be implied or explicit in normative expectations held by faculty who are

associated with the preparation of school administrators.

Another perspective, and that which is of primary concern in this paper, is that the actions of administrators may be judged in terms of their rightness or wrongness according to accepted standards of good conduct. What the moral principles, the reasoning, and the standards of goodness, that are applied in deciding that the administrator's actions are right or wrong? Compounding the moral issue in this instance is that there may be competing standards of goodness applied in judging the administrator's actions; and, as well, the standards may not only be competing, but may conflict in moral terms. For example, we want our administrators to be honest, but honesty may not be prudent in all situations. How is the administrator to know what he ought to do? Moral reasoning is a tool the administrator can use to identify and analyze the moral dimensions of the dilemma and arrive at a conclusion regarding what action ought to be taken -- a normative judgement of moral obligation is made to purse one course of action versus another. And, often, normative judgements of moral value (her motives as a teacher are excellent) accompany and precede the decision regarding what one ought to do in the particular circumstance.

The school administrator often is faced with the necessity to act in the face of **competing** and oftentimes **conflicting** moral values regarding a particular action or decision. A major dilemma for the administrator is the necessity to choose one moral value

over another. For example, among the competing values that might be applied in judging the rightness or wrongness of particular actions or decisions are those associated with friendship, good pedagogical practice, compliance with organizational rules and regulations, political expediency, educational outcomes, another's needs, and organizational efficiency and/or effectiveness.

It frequently is not clear what a school administrator **ought** to do. The moral dilemma in this instance is not whether the administrator is ethical or not; it is that one must decide which value to prefer over another (when either one or the other may be the more desirable depending upon one's moral reasoning within the particular context). What is at issue in this perspective are competing (sometimes conflicting) moral values and skill (or the lack of it) in moral reasoning.

Yet another perspective associated with the moral dimension of the school administrator's work-world is that associated with efforts to persuade and influence others to a particular point of view or course of action. The concern here is with leadership rooted in moral authority. Among the kinds of influence employed by an administrator is authority that relies upon moral and ideological sources residing (a) within the situation of the school itself and (b) within the values and beliefs of the actors themselves, the teachers and the school principal. Referred to as the **"professional"** style of school leader (Greenfield, 1991b), this approach to leadership reflects an orientation rooted in an assumed

obligation or duty on the part of teachers and the principal alike to do whatever is necessary to serve the best interests of children. The administrator proceeds from this assumption and cultivates this perspective within teachers. The basis for the administrator's ability to exercise authority is a belief by the other (the teacher) in the goodness or rightness (in moral terms) of the administrator's point of view. In this example, the moral or ethical dimension of concern is neither the character nor the specific actions of the administrator (although both of these are relevant) but, rather, the **moral** basis of the authority relationship between the administrator and the teacher. This is a particularly significant dimension because the school administrator (unlike counterparts in other organizations) must rely so extensively upon leadership to administer the school (Greenfield, 1991a).

The following observations by contributors to the emerging literature on ethics and values in school administration offer more specific examples of the scope and the complexity of the moral dimension of the school administrator's work. The purpose in selecting these observations from the literature is to illustrate different aspects of the moral dimension of the school administrator's work. As Crowson observes:

> A first and most difficult question, of course, is just which daily work life decisions present ethical-choice problems and which do not? To a large degree **all** administrative decisions are rooted in moral codes and cultural values, thus all decisions have an ethical component. Not all decisions, however, face the site-level administrator with the direct, immediate, and conscious

> need to weigh competing "goods." Many of the administrator's day-by-day decisions are routine, prescribed by standard operating procedures, or are well internalized throughout the bureaucracy as "the way we do things here." There may be moral dilemmas aplenty in these routines, but they are seldom questioned. The keys to an understanding of these noncontemplative arenas of decision making are (a) consistency and (b) lack of variability. Even though to the outside observer there may appear to be an ethics that is ignored, to the insider, the direction to be pursued is a "given" within the organizational environment.
>
> (1989: 418)

As Simon (1957) observes, all decisions have value as well as factual premises. Indeed, every decision ultimately requires that a judgement among alternatives be made, and doing so in a rational manner requires the assignment of values to alternatives and their associated outcomes. Even though the decision-making calculus employed by school administrators may not be nearly so rational as that envisioned by Simon, **any** decision by the administrator requires the assignment of value to alternatives and a judgement among the alternatives. While of necessity many of the school administrator's decisions and policies are reflected in habituated responses and routines viewed as "givens" by school participants, there **are** ethical dimensions to these routines and policies. As Crowson points out in his discussion, what makes these and other choices ethically problematic for the school principal is when there is more than one standard of goodness to be considered. It is not that there are competing ethical systems at stake, but rather that a choice must be made in the face of competing values within the particular decision/action context.

Crowson (1989) suggests school principals experience three

ethics & admin

distinct types of ethical dilemmas:

1. A situation in which an organizational or professional norm provides clear guidance as to what one's decision ought to be, but circumstances associated with implementation are problematic.

2. A second type of dilemma was associated with the instance in which compliance with a formal organizational rule, policy, or directive conflicts with school-level concerns of students, parents, teachers, or perhaps good pedagogical practice.

3. The third type of dilemma is that which stems from the particular idiosyncratic personality or style of the individual principal. That is, the decision dilemma is rooted in the individual's concern that actions guided by one personal standard (to help the less fortunate) may violate another personal standard (to not treat others in a condescending manner).

These are examples of the second type of perspective associated with the moral dimension: the necessity to choose among competing value preferences. Crowson's conclusion, based upon a secondary analysis of data collected in an earlier study of administrative discretion in decision making (Morris et al 1984), is that school principals experience on average about one such ethical dilemma each day.

In another illustration of the moral dimension of the school administrator's work-world, Hostetler (1986) raises a more fundamental type of ethical concern that centers on the use of

power in schools and how the exercise of power may violate the importance of the fundamental Kantian ideal of respect for persons. The Kantian standard to which Hostetler subscribes holds that it always is wrong to treat a person merely as an object or as an instrumental means. Given this view, Hostetler suggests certain leadership methods are suspect. The concern in this instance is not over competing value preferences but, rather, is a more fundamental dilemma rooted in a particular ethical system. He offers an example:

> Suppose that one Thursday afternoon a principal is thinking about the weekly, before-school faculty meeting scheduled for the next morning. Two teachers on the faculty of 30 complained about the duty schedule. The principal feels certain these two will broach their complaints at the meeting, an event he would prefer to avoid.
>
> The principal decides to use the meeting to speak about the condition of the school's hallways and get the teachers' suggestions about brightening them with displays, decorations or other things. She is concerned with improving the hall environment, but she also is fairly certain that the length of the discussion will prevent the duty issue from coming up.

In following this plan, the principal will have done things that are ethically questionable:

1. She will have avoided problems of real concern to some of the faculty (violation of self-determinacy);

2. She will have failed to give reasons for her actions and to deal with the teachers' problems in a rational way (violation of intellectual integrity);

3. She will have taken a view of her faculty as incapable of conforming to standards of fruitful discussion and argumentation (violation of rule-following criterion).

The example used is problematic enough that many good ~~reasons~~ for the principal's decision could be suggested. However, inherent in controlling the agenda are ethical problems which make it impossible to give a blanket justification for such a power tactic.

(Hostetler, 1986: 32-33)

The author goes on to describe the various ethical concerns in this example and discusses the conditions which are and are not acceptable uses of power in relation to students, teachers, and parents. Hostetler is applying a very special and narrow usage in employing the concept of power to mean **control over** the behaviors and actions of others. Hostetler excludes from this conception of power actions like influence, persuasion, argument, discussion, and the like where-in respect for the other (by the one doing the persuading) is not compromised.

In examining the potential tensions between the use of power tactics by school administrators and the ethic of respect for teachers, students, and parents as **persons**, Hostetler seeks to foster a heightened awareness on the part of administrators that the "guiding principles for leadership are transactional, not coercive or charismatic." (1986: 35) This example suggests an ethical dilemma rooted in more general principles of moral conduct extending beyond the profession of education and the school organization. It suggests the very real necessity on the part of individuals to consider the ethical dimensions of their actions in light of a more fundamental system of ethics than one might find associated with a particular profession or organizational type or context.

Yet another aspect of the moral dimension of administering a school is reflected in conceptions of leadership. In terms of

leadership, one would expect a consideration of moral values to occur in a number of ways. **What** values will prevail, in **whose** judgement and by what ethical standards are those considered critical or essential, and **how** will they manifest themselves within the school?

While there are many aspects associated with the concept of leadership, of central importance are the ideas of change and improvement. Given this premise, leadership involves the assignment of value to a phenomenon observed (what is or is not occurring, what one thinks ought to be happening, etc.) and the application of criteria rooted in one or another standard of goodness. These are conditions necessary for rendering a responsible judgement regarding the desirability of what is observed or of decisions, actions, or consequences considered in response to what is observed. In other words, the very activity of leading involves "valuing" and "judging" and applying "standards of goodness".

Similarly, in reflecting upon the idea of "vision", for example, whose vision is it, in what standards of good practice is the vision rooted, and how is the vision to be achieved? An example of these aspects of the moral dimension is reflected in the following observations about the ideas of "moral imagination", "value leadership", and "moral authority":

> So when we speak of "vision," or of "moral imagination," we refer to that quality of character that distinguishes the morally educated person, that gives that individual the ability to see that the world need not remain as it is -- that it is possible for it to be otherwise, and to be better....Vision, the capacity to exercise moral imagination, is the foundation upon which the moral

> authority of the principal rests. It is what enables the principal to lead a school well....Vision, the capacity to exercise moral imagination, is the foundation upon which the moral authority of the principal rests. It is what enables the principal to lead a school well.
>
> (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986:228)

> The essential but frequently underestimated challenge for the principal who would "lead" teachers is the necessity to meaningfully and authentically engage teachers' motives, needs, and values; to identify what those are; to make the "connection" between those and the desired vision; and to raise teachers' consciousness regarding those connections. Actions and decisions related to raising teachers' moral consciousness are the central thrust of what is termed "value leadership".
>
> (Greenfield, 1987a:17)

> Evolving a vision thus entails the exercise of moral imagination ...a process that involves observing the current state of affairs in a school and making a judgement about whether the current state is satisfactory. Implicit in the activity of making a judgement is the application of some standard of goodness. This involves a consideration of what is observed, in light of the standard that is applied, that results in a decision either to leave things as they are or to try and change them for the better.
>
> (Greenfield, 1988a:216-17)

As can be seen from the foregoing, the moral dimension of the administrator's work-world is very complex and is characterized by a number of ethical issues:

(a) Considerations of moral value and obligation are embedded in practically every administrative action and decision, and as well in many if not all organizational and education policies and procedures within the school. Many, perhaps most, of these are accepted by teachers, parents, and students as "givens".

(b) Empirical data suggests that school principals experience ethical dilemmas on a daily basis as they perform the duties and

responsibilities of their office, and that they often experience frustration and conflict in resolving and managing these dilemmas.

(c) There are at least five different types of ethical dilemmas experienced by school principals including:

1. Dilemmas of choice rooted in fundamental ethical principles of conduct and extending across professions and organizational types. The Kantian ideal of respect for persons and the existentialist's ethic of "free expression" are but two of many standards rooted in a number of different (and often conflicting) ethical systems that may find expression among one or another of the school's participants.

2. Dilemmas which arise in the necessity to choose among competing standards of good practice rooted within the profession of education. There are, for example, competing standards of good teaching and good administration, of how best to teach reading or history, of the proper role of the teacher and the student, etc. For example, while our fundamental professional ethic may be to serve the best interest of the child, there may be considerable disagreement regarding which techniques, strategies, or processes are to be preferred.

3. Dilemmas of choice associated with conflicts between system-level organizational rules or policies and considerations at the school-level. As Crowson (1989) indicates, it is not unusual for a school principal to experience a dilemma where-in there is a conflict between the directives or policies of superiors and

site-level considerations associated with timing, the effect on other initiatives already underway, the availability of resources, and the interests of the immediate school community.

4. Dilemmas associated with the implementation or consequences of decisions attendant to an ethically preferred choice among alternative courses of action. While the preferred decision or action may be clear, implementation contingencies may make it impossible to elect the preferred alternative.

5. Dilemmas which stem from idiosyncratic beliefs or concerns of individual administrators regarding the consequences of their actions and decisions. As Crowson (1989) suggests, a principal may hesitate to act or decide out of concern that the action or decision may be misinterpreted, and because in the principal's view the misinterpretation would represent an ethic to which the principal does not subscribe.

Methods to Articulate Ethics in Administrator Training

As explained elsewhere, most of the moral socialization of the school administrator occurs informally and in an unplanned manner during the preservice teaching years (Greenfield, 1977 a and b; 1983; 1985 a and b). While it could be otherwise, the dominant condition in the career socialization of school administrators is one which fosters a custodial orientation to the role as presented, in technical as well as moral terms (Greenfield, 1986b). The effect of the present system of administrator training is to maintain the status quo, both in moral as well as in technical terms.

ethics & admin

While there is general agreement that the training of school administrators needs substantial reform, there is a paucity of effort to substantively rethink the content and purpose of administrator preparation programs. Practically all of the reform efforts and discussions to date merely call for more of the same old stuff -- emphasis on the acquisition of a technical-rational knowledge-base that has limited applicability to the daily **doing** of educational administration, particularly at the principalship level. While I have elsewhere suggested why this is the case and what will be necessary before there is a substantive change in the goals and processes of administrator preparation (Greenfield, 1988), some of those observations will be repeated here as they are very relevant to the focus of this paper -- methods to articulate ethics in administrator training.

The rationale underlying the need to more systematically introduce ethics and the development of skill in moral reasoning into the training of school administrators is quite simple and rests upon four key ideas:

1. The school is a moral institution. It serves a vital moral socialization function in our society in contributing to the formation of children's core values and beliefs, and to their development of the knowledge and skills needed to assume the responsibilities and enjoy the benefits of full and productive citizenship in a society committed to democratic ideals.

2. The principal is a moral agent. Because the school is a

moral institution, and because children have virtually no voice in where they will attend school, what they will be taught, or by whom, the school administrator has a special responsibility to be a conscientious moral actor, that is, to undertake the responsibilities and obligations of that office in a **distinctly** moral manner. Distinctly moral conduct by a principal means that one's actions and decisions are grounded in deliberate reflection upon and consideration of the moral consequences of one's actions and the attendant policies, curriculum, and associated practices (for which the school principal is responsible by virtue of the office held).

3. As implored by the first standard in the Statement of Ethics for School Administrators (AASA, 1981), the educational administrator: "Makes the well-being of students the fundamental value of all decision making and actions".

4. Finally, as evidenced in empirical studies of the daily work of school administration, it is clear that school principals face a moral value conflict on practically a daily basis. There is ample evidence of the magnitude and the centrality of the moral dimension of the work of school administration.

For these reasons the preservice training of school administrators should reflect a substantial opportunity to develop and practice using the knowledge, skills, beliefs, values, and attitudes needed to administer a school in a distinctly moral manner. While it is not my purpose here to outline in detail the

scope of such a curriculum, it would at a minimum train prospective administrators to identify the ethical issues at stake in any given action or decision circumstance, and to offer a defensible recommendation and accompanying rationale regarding a proposed course of action. In short, to be competent in the skills of moral reasoning.

It would not be the purpose of such a curriculum to teach administrators to be virtuous, as it is assumed that efforts are undertaken at the time of recruitment and selection into a training program to identify the moral commitments and the character of those selected. I do not believe it is possible to teach virtue, or to teach one to be ethical per se, although certainly it is hoped that such a curriculum would result in a heightened awareness among prospective administrators of the necessity on their part to make normative judgements grounded in an understanding of and a commitment to the moral values and obligations attending the role and office of school administrator. What such a training program can do, however, is enable individuals to acquire the knowledge, practice the skills, and develop attitudes that will enable administrators to identify and analyze the ethical dimensions of the kinds of problems and decisions they can expect to experience in **doing** school administration, and to build personal confidence and the courage needed to make often times very difficult normative judgements.

Whether school administrators are ethical, or whether they

are able to resolve moral value dilemmas in an ethically satisfactory manner given different school and community norms, is largely a matter of the manner of their character. Regarding this point, we can increase the likelihood of ethical practice by being very careful in the identification and selection of those admitted to preservice programs, and by complementing careful recruitment and selection with a **deliberate** effort to develop their ability to view and think about the problems and decisions of administration in ethical terms; to develop their competence in the skills of moral reasoning.

Now, how might values and ethics be articulated in training school administrators? There are numerous ways to do this, including the following five strategies:

1. Modify the curriculum of preparation to include specific training in the identification and analysis of problems and decisions in ethical terms. This strategy presumes a grounding in moral philosophy, to a greater or lesser degree. The minimal introduction would seem to be something like Ethics: A Course of Study for Educational Leaders (Kimbrough, 1985), or a parallel curriculum. Obviously the more extensive the grounding in moral philosophy and practice in identifying and analyzing problems and decisions in ethical terms the more likely it is that recruits would develop the needed knowledge, skills, and attitudes for competence in the skill of moral reasoning. A strategy like this could range in intensity from a fairly limited series of "values

clarification" exercises to a more fully developed curriculum exploring moral philosophy and strategies of ethical analysis and their implications for school administrators. A middle-ground might incorporate a course of study such as that designed by Kimbrough with practice in using strategies for resolving moral value dilemmas (such as the model developed by Tymchuk, 1982). Examples of works that could provide a basis for such a course of study include Dewey's Democracy in Education (1966), Moral Principles in Education (1975), and Human Nature and Conduct (1957), Foster's Paradigms and Promises in Educational Administration (1986), Frankena's Ethics (1973), Green's The Formation of Conscience in an Age of Technology (1984), Grant's The World We Created at Hamilton High (1988), Kimbrough's Ethics: A Course of Study for Educational Leaders (1985), and Strike et al's Ethics in Administration (1988).

2. Integrate within the existing curriculum **multiple and varied opportunities** for students to acquire knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed for ethical reasoning. Under this model a program might incorporate case studies or simulations within the more technical curriculum such that a course in finance might include a resource allocation dilemma, or a course in supervision or personnel might include several conflict of moral values problems or dilemmas associated with evaluation and retention of teachers or students. Obviously if this were preceded by a specific (but perhaps more limited curriculum than envisioned above) effort

ethics & admin

to heighten students' awareness of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed for ethical reasoning, the effort would probably be more potent. Although there is not systematic evidence for the assertion, I imagine this alternative (without the specific but limited exposure to knowledge, skills, and attitudes) characterizes present efforts in many administrator preparation programs. It is not anticipated that this is a very potent or effective strategy. What is problematic is that a majority of professors in the field of administrator preparation probably deem the current condition sufficient.

3. Develop a specific curriculum which emphasizes the development and understanding of particular points of view regarding the moral values and obligations attending school administration, and provides multiple opportunities to observe and apply this ethical stance to problems and decisions in actual school settings. To increase the potency and effect of this curriculum, provide many additional practice opportunities in the remainder of the preservice curriculum; i.e., integrate an ethical dimension into the remainder of the curriculum, giving students successive opportunities in multiple and different aspects of the preparation curriculum to apply the knowledge, skills, and attitudes acquired earlier. This strategy obviously takes a great deal of commitment, consensus, and coordination on the part of a faculty. I believe these ideas, or a variation, have been implemented by the administration faculty at Miami University, as

a result of their curriculum development efforts through the Danforth Foundation. This is an excellent strategy, although it presumes a degree of consensus, commitment, and coordination among faculty that may be uncommon in our field.

4. Develop a "problem-driven" curriculum as an alternative to the traditional "course-driven" curriculum (Bridges, 1989). Design the problems and associated problem-solving and policy analysis expectations to assure that students acquire and develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed for ethical analysis, and to assure that problems and decisions are explored in an integrated fashion (as they occur in the world of administrative practice).

5. Require that prospective administrators conduct a series of investigations of instructional, managerial, and related practices and policies in several different school settings with the deliberate intent of identifying and analyzing the problems of equity and equality for students and for teachers. Upon collection and analysis of the necessary data in each investigation, one would be expected to develop a recommendation with an accompanying rationale regarding what is right and wrong and what could be done to improve the situation. One would be expected to articulate and defend one's thesis in a public forum, and to have the thesis critiqued by a panel of school administrators, teachers, parents, and school board members. A key element is to conduct at least three such investigations in different schools, and to have the results of one's analysis and recommendations held up to the

scrutiny of distinguished school administrators. A variation of this strategy is currently operationalized in the administrator preparation program at Stanford University (Bridges, 1989).

It is relatively easy to think of ways to introduce ethics in administrator training. The challenge is to actually implement such strategies. Obviously, if the will exists among a faculty, the challenge is not insurmountable. The most difficult aspect of such curriculum initiatives, however, is that they are likely to be strongly resisted (or passively resisted) by faculty. There are several reasons for this. First, because most faculty in educational administration have no training in ethical analysis, moral philosophy, or the strategies for identifying and resolving moral value dilemmas, few would be expected to initiate or to even volunteer to assist with the development of such a curriculum. Second, a very large majority of faculty in educational administration (I suspect the preponderance of faculty) already are very heavily invested, in terms of training, expertise, and personal commitment and familiarity, in one or several dimensions of the **technical** curriculum traditionally associated with the preparation of school principals and superintendents. Third, the dominant paradigm in the preparation of school administrators continues to be rooted in the technical-rational model of organization and administration that emerged with the theory movement in the 1950's and 1960's. Finally, there seems to be a strong undercurrent within the profession of school administration

that what passes for administrator training in many universities is pretty benign at best, and thus it is unlikely that sufficient support could be mustered to sustain a serious and fundamental reform initiative (although such reform is desperately needed)!

In concluding these comments regarding the moral socialization of school administrators, I wish to emphasize that this is a critical and much neglected dimension of administrator training, and that despite the gloomy picture painted here regarding the likelihood of substantial reform in the near future, I do believe that changes are nevertheless possible. One ray of hope shines in the continuing critiques of the dominant (in the U.S. at least) positivist paradigm by the Australian, Canadian, and British community of scholars in educational administration (including a few in the United States). Another resides in the emerging foundationalist perspective nurtured in part by the initiatives of the Danforth Foundation and the work of individual scholars like William Foster, Yvonna Lincoln, Gary Anderson, Joe Blase, and others.

One final comment for those among us who believe that moral development warrants a central place in the curriculum of school administrator preparation. Work closely with your colleagues in educational foundations (history, sociology, anthropology, and philosophy of education) to develop curricula that address the issues raised here. Do not merely require students to complete the standard course in history or philosophy of education. For the

purposes envisioned in this paper such courses are as poorly suited as those constituting the dominant curriculum in educational administration. Instead, work with your foundations of education colleagues to help them develop curricula grounded in realistic and contemporary problems of school practice (as actually experienced by parents, students, teachers, and administrators), to which concepts drawn from social theory, moral philosophy, and the historical and continuing problems of racism, poverty, and gender and language discrimination might be applied. The point is not to have students memorize names, dates, and theories of educational philosophy, but rather to help them develop a perspective and the skills and sensitivities needed to identify, analyze, and act to right the wrongs that are so prevalent in so many of our nation's schools. The purpose of such a curriculum would be to heighten individual awareness of and commitment to the moral values and obligations associated with good school administration, and to enable prospective principals and superintendents to develop their competence in the skills of moral reasoning.

References

American Association of School Administrators (1981). Statement of Ethics. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Blumberg, A. and Greenfield, W.D. (1986). The Effective Principal. 2nd ed. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Bridges, E. (1989). "Combining Theory, Research and Practice: Problem-based Learning." University Council for Educational Administration Convention: Tempe, AZ

Crowson, R. (1989). "Managerial Ethics in Educational

Administration: The Rational Choice Approach". Urban Education. 23 no. 4: 412-435.

Dewey, J. (1957). Human Nature and Conduct. New York: The Modern Library, Inc.

_____ (1966). Democracy and Education. New York: The Free Press.

_____ (1975). Moral Principles in Education. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and Promises: New Approaches to Educational Administration. Buffalo, N.Y.: Prometheus Books.

Frankena, W. (1973). Ethics. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Grant, G. (1988). The World We Created at Hamilton High. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Green, T. (1984). The Formation of Conscience in an Age of Technology. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, The John Dewey Society.

Greenfield, W.D. (1991a). "Toward a Theory of School Leadership." American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

_____ (1991b). "The Micropolitics of Leadership in an Urban Elementary School." American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL.

_____ (1988a). "Moral Imagination, Interpersonal Competence, and the Work of School Administrators." In Leaders for America's Schools. Ed. D.E. Griffiths, R.T. Stout, and P.B. Forsyth. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Company.

_____ (1988b). "The Challenges of Leadership Preparation: Thoughts on Reforming the Preparation Curriculum in Educational Administration." University Council for Educational Administration Convention, Cincinnati, OH.

_____ (1987a). "Moral Imagination and Interpersonal Competence: Antecedents to Instructional Leadership." In Instructional Leadership: Concepts, Issues and Controversies. Ed. W.D. Greenfield. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

_____ (1987b). "Moral Imagination and Value Leadership in Schools." American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

_____ (1986a). "Moral Imagination, Interpersonal Competence, and The Work of School Administrators." American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

_____ (1986b). "Moral, Social, and Technical Dimensions of the Principalship." Peabody Journal of Education 63, (Fall) 138-149.

_____ (1985a). "Being and Becoming a Principal: Responses to Work Contexts and Socialization Processes." American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

_____ (1985b). "The Moral Socialization of School Administrators: Informal Role Learning Outcomes." Educational Administration Quarterly 21, no. 4 (Fall) 99-120.

_____ (1983). "Career Dynamics of Educators: Research and Policy Issues." Educational Administration Quarterly 19, no. 2 (Spring) 5-26.

_____ (1977a). "Administrative Candidacy: A Process of New Role Learning--Part II." Journal of Educational Administration 15, no. 2 (October) 170-193.

_____ (1977b). "Administrative Candidacy: A Process of New Role Learning--Part I." Journal of Educational Administration 15, no. 1 (May) 30-48.

Hostetler, K. (1986). "Ethics and Power: Implications for the Principal's Leadership." NASSP Bulletin 70, no. 488; 31-36.

Kimbrough, R. (1985). Ethics: A Course of Study for Educational Leaders. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Morris, V.C., R.L. Crowson, C. Porter-Gehrie, and E. Hurwitz (1984). Principals in Action: The Reality of Managing Schools. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Simon, H.A. (1976). Administrative Behavior. 3ed.New York: The Free Press.

Strike, K.A., E.J. Haller, and J.F. Soltis (1988). The Ethics of School Administration. NY: Teachers College Press.

Tymchuk, A. (1982). "Strategies for Resolving Value Dilemmas." American Behavioral Scientist. 26, no. 2: 159-175.